

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Viginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DAT | re | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|------------|---------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 09/553,956 | 04/21/2000 | 0 . | Thomas A. Runkler | 50277-452 | 7423 |
| 7 | 590 07/0 | 08/2003 | | | |
| Stephen C Carlson | | | | EXAMINER | |
| Ditthavong & Carlson P C 10507 Braddock Road | | | PHAM, HUNG Q | | |
| Suite A Fairfax, VA 22032 | | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| , | | | | 2172 | 17 |
| | | | | DATE MAILED: 07/08/2003 | / > |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | / | | | | |
|--|---|---|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Advisory Action | 09/553,956 | RUNKLER ET AL. | , | | | | |
| Advisory Addon | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | | |
| | HUNG Q PHAM | 2172 | | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence add | ress | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 26 June 2003 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | oid abandonment of this application application abandonment of this application abandonent which | ation. A proper reply n places the applica | y to a tion in | | | | |
| PERIOD FOR RE | EPLY [check either a) or b)] | | | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). | Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing | g date of the final rejecti | on. | | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.136(a). | of extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply be later than three months after the mail | unt of the fee. The approriginally set in the final | opriate extension Office action; or | | | | |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF | | | | | | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be | ecause: | | | | | | |
| (a) they raise new issues that would require further | er consideration and/or search (| see NOTE below); | | | | | |
| (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below); | | | | | | | |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or | n better form for appeal by mate | rially reducing or sir | nplifying the | | | | |
| (d) they present additional claims without canceliNOTE: | ng a corresponding number of fi | nally rejected claim | s. | | | | |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject | ion(s): | | | | | | |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | | eparate, timely filed | amendment | | | | |
| 5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because: | | dered but does NO | T place the | | | | |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | ause it is not directed SOLELY t | o issues which were | e newly | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we | | | ınd an | | | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-8, 10, 12-25, 27, 29-34</u> . | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 9,11,26 and | 128. Are cancelled | | | | | | |
| 8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is | a) approved or b) disapp | roved by the Exami | ner. | | | | |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer | nt(s)(PTO-1449) | | | | | | |
| 10. Other: | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

The limitations in claims 9, 11, 26, 28 are canceled and incorporated into independent claims 1, 10, 18, and 27 respectively. Please see the final rejections, paragraph No. 3 in the Office Action 03/25/2003.

Regarding to the argument of claims 17, 34 in page 14 of the Amendment paper number 12, a *partition coefficient* is defined by applicants in page 15, lines 3-5 of the Specification,

a partition coefficient, which quantifies the goodness of the clustering, is computed for each dimension as a measure of cluster validity or how well separated the clusters are.

As disclosed by Hall, the decision tree allows the classification of examples into two classes and each class is associated with a node of the tree by choosing an attribute whose values may split the examples up into more homogeneous groups as *cluster analyses along each of the features for a plurality of cluster number* (Decision trees from C4.5, page 1757). The attribute values of a continuous valued attribute are each examined as a possible attribute to split the example set at a node in a decision tree. The selection of a specific value is based upon the information gain ratio associated with choosing that attribute. The attribute, which has the highest information gain associated with it is chosen as the attribute for splitting the examples at a node (page 1758). Thus, the information gain ratio of each feature in the training set is to split the training data into more homogeneous groups, or in other words, is to *quantify the goodness of the clustering, or how well separated the clusters are*, and the technique of Hall as discussed indicates the step of *performing a plurality of cluster analyses along said each of the*

features for a plurality of cluster numbers to calculate information gain values as respective partition coefficients; and determining the highest information gain as maximal cluster validity measure from among the partition coefficients or information gain values.

> KIM VU SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100